CITY OF BELMONT PARK IMPACT FEE NEXUS STUDY

OCTOBER 2014
FINAL REPORT

PREPARED FOR:

BELMONT CITY COUNCIL

PREPARED BY:

SCIConsultingGroup

4745 Mangels Boulevard Fairfield, California 94534 Phone 707.430.4300 Fax 707.430.4319 www.sci-cg.com



CITY OF BELMONT

CITY COUNCIL

Warren Lieberman, Mayor David Braunstein, Vice Mayor Eric Reed, Council Member Charles Stone, Council Member Cathy Wright, Council Member

CITY MANAGER

Greg Scoles

FINANCE DIRECTOR

Thomas Fil

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

Carlos de Melo

PARKS AND RECREATION DIRECTOR

Jonathan Gervais

CITY ATTORNEY

Scott Rennie

LEGAL COUNSEL

Barbara E. Kautz, Goldfarb & Lipman LLP

CONSULTANT

Blair Aas, SCI Consulting Group



ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This Park Impact Fee Nexus Study was prepared by SCI Consulting Group under contract with the City of Belmont.

The work was accomplished under the general direction of Thomas Fil, Finance Director of the City of Belmont.

We would like to acknowledge the special efforts made by individuals and organizations to this project:

Jonathan Gervais, Parks and Recreation Department Nawel Voelker, City of Belmont Finance Department Carlos de Melo, Community Development Department Scott Rennie, City Attorney Barbara E. Kautz, Goldfarb & Lipman LLP



TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	••••
Introduction	
Nexus Requirements	
SUMMARY OF GENERAL FINDINGS	3
SUMMARY OF GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS	
EXISTING PARK FACILITIES AND LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS	5
PER CAPITA COST COMPONENTS	7
DEVELOPMENT COSTS PER CAPITA	7
RESIDENTIAL PARK IMPACT FEE DETERMINATION	9
Park Impact Fee Cost Components	9
RESIDENTIAL LAND USE CATEGORIES	
DWELLING UNIT OCCUPANCY FACTOR	10
RESIDENTIAL PARK IMPACT FEE	
NEXUS FINDINGS FOR THE RESIDENTIAL PARK IMPACT FEE	11
Nonresidential Park Impact Fee Determination	13
EMPLOYEE EQUIVALENT DEMAND FACTOR	13
Nonresident Employee Factor	14
COST PER EMPLOYEE	
Nonresidential Land Use Categories	
Nonresidential Park Impact Fee Determination	
NEXUS FINDINGS FOR NONRESIDENTIAL PARK IMPACT FEES	16
PARK IMPACT FEE PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION AND ADMINISTRATION	18
APPENDIX A – CURRENT AND PROJECTED POPULATION THROUGH 2035 (CITY OF BELMONT).	21
APPENDIX B – PARK AND OPEN SPACE INVENTORY	22
ADDENDLY C _ DARK IMPACT FEE SCHEDIN E BY COST COMPONENT	23

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 1 – PROPOSED PARK IMPACT FEES	4
Figure 2 – Existing Park Facilities and Comparison of Level of Service Standards .	6
FIGURE 3 – PARK DEVELOPMENT COST PER CAPITA	7
FIGURE 4 – TRAIL DEVELOPMENT COST PER CAPITA	8
FIGURE 5 – PARK IMPACT FEE COST COMPONENTS	9
Figure 6 – Dwelling Unit Occupancy Factor (City of Belmont)	10
FIGURE 7 – RESIDENTIAL PARK IMPACT FEE	11
FIGURE 8 – EMPLOYEE EQUIVALENT DEMAND FACTOR	13
FIGURE 9 – NONRESIDENT EMPLOYEE FACTOR	14
FIGURE 10 – COST PER EMPLOYEE	14
FIGURE 11 – NONRESIDENTIAL PARK IMPACT FEE	16
Figure 12 – Population Projection through 2035	21
FIGURE 13 – PARK AND OPEN SPACE INVENTORY	22
FIGURE 14 – PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL PARK IMPACT FEE SCHEDULE BY COST COMPONENT	23
FIGURE 15 - MONDESIDENTIAL PARK IMPACT FEE SCHEDULE BY COST COMPONENT	23



Introduction

Over the next twenty years, new development within the City of Belmont ("City") will create a need for additional park and recreational facilities since the existing park and recreational facilities are insufficient in number, size, location, and the kinds of recreational opportunities which they present to meet the park and recreational needs of both the City's existing service population and additional service population generated by such new development. Based on the City's General Plan and Parks and Open Space Master Plan, the City's goal is to provide five acres of neighborhood and community park facilities for every one thousand new residents.

In order to provide adequate funding to achieve these long-term objectives, park impact fees are need to fund new development's share of the cost of new park and recreational facilities and improvements. According to the City's Master Plan and current population estimates, the City will grow to approximately 28,735 residents by 2035. This Park Impact Fee Nexus Study ("Nexus Study") was prepared pursuant to the "Mitigation Fee Act" as found in Government Code § 66000 et seq. The purpose of this Nexus Study is to establish the legal and policy basis for the imposition of new citywide park impact fees ("fees") on new residential and nonresidential development within the City of Belmont ("City").

This Nexus Study was prepared parallel to another study entitled *Quimby Land Dedication* and *In-Lieu Fee Study*, April 2014 ("Quimby Study"). The Quimby Study updates City's Quimby Land Dedication and In-Lieu Fee program and details the City's requirements for dedication of land for parks or fees in lieu of land dedication for new residential subdivisions. The Quimby Study looks only at the need for park improvements and facilities and does not included land costs required for park expansion. Consequently the two fees do not pay for the same public improvements.

METHODOLOGY / APPROACH

Since the need for park and recreational services is service population driven, this Nexus Study utilizes a per capita standard-based methodology to determine the City's park impact fees. Under this method, the cost components are based on the City's <u>existing level of service</u> ("LOS") standard for park, open space and trail development. This conservative approach excludes any costs associated with new City recreational facilities such as gymnasiums, community centers and aquatic facilities.



The per capita cost of park, open space and trail development needed to serve new residential development are established within this Nexus Study. The total per capita costs are then applied to four residential land uses categories according to their respective occupancy (population) per dwelling unit to establish a cost / fee per new dwelling unit.

For nonresidential park impact fees, total per capita costs are first multiplied by an employee equivalent demand factor and a nonresident employee factor to determine the cost per employee. The cost per employee is then applied to three nonresidential land use categories according to their respective employment density to establish a cost / fee per square foot of new building area.

Nexus Requirements

In order to impose park impact fees, this Nexus Study demonstrates that a reasonable relationship or "nexus" exists between new development that occurs within the City and the need for additional park and recreational facilities as a result of new development. More specifically, this Nexus Study presents the necessary findings in order to meet the procedural requirements of the Mitigation Fee Act, also known as AB 1600, which are as follows:

- Identify the purpose of the fee;
- Identify the use to which the fee is to be put;
- Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the fee's use and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed;
- Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facility and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed;
- Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee
 and the cost of the public facility or portion of the public facility attributable to the
 development on which the fee is imposed.



SUMMARY OF GENERAL FINDINGS

Based on the research and analysis conducted for this Nexus Study, the following general findings are presented:

- 1. Park impact fees, pursuant to the Mitigation Fee Act, are needed to ensure that the City can construct park and recreation facilities and improvements needed for the population growth created by new development.
- 2. Based on the City's current population and existing park facilities, the City's existing LOS is 3.87 acres of park area, 0.37 miles of trails and 12.13 acres of open space for every 1,000 residents. The City's Master Plan LOS goal is 5 acres of developed neighborhood and community parks for every 1,000 residents.
- 3. Based on recent cost estimates for Davey Glen Park, the average cost for new park development is \$448,000 per acre.
- 4. A reasonable relationship or "nexus" exists between new development in the City and the need for additional developed parks and recreational facilities as a result of new development.
- 5. This park impact fee program and proposed park impact fees for the City are consistent with the policies of the City of Belmont General Plan.



SUMMARY OF GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings presented in this Nexus Study, the following general recommendations are presented:

1. The City of Belmont should adopt park impact fees in order to fairly allocate the cost of park development attributable to new development.

FIGURE 1 – PROPOSED PARK IMPACT FEES

Land Use Catergory	Proposed Park Impact Fees
Residential Development	Per Unit
Single-Family Detached	\$5,079
Single-Family Attached	\$4,513
Multi-Family Residential	\$3,795
Second Unit	\$1,888
Nonresidential Development	Per Sq. Ft.
Retail / Other Commercial	\$0.36
Office	\$0.52
Industrial	\$0.35

- 2. The City should periodically conduct a review of park development costs and building trends in the City. If costs change significantly in either direction, this Nexus Study should be updated and the park impact fees adjusted accordingly.
- 3. The City's park impact fees should be adopted and implemented in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Mitigation Fee Act (California Government Code § 66000 et seq.).

This Nexus Study utilizes a per capita-standard based methodology to determine the park impact fees because the need for and demand for park and recreational services is driven by its service population. Using this approach, new park and recreational facility costs are reduced to a cost per capita based on the City's existing LOS standards for such facilities.

This section generally describes the City's existing park facilities and Master Plan goals for each. Figure 2 on the following page presents the LOS standards used in this Nexus Study for determining the proposed park impact fees.

PARKS

According to the City's 1992 Parks and Open Space Master Plan, neighborhood parks are typically a combination playground and park designed primarily for non-supervised, non-organized recreation activities. They are typically 2 to 10 acres in size. Mini Parks are smaller parks (1/4 acre to 2 acres) located within a residential area to provide play areas for small children or passive siting areas for residents. Community parks, ideally 20 acres + in size, are designed for organized groups or team sports, while also providing facilities for individual and family activities. School parks are city parks developed on school district property in cooperation with the school to provide neighborhood park-type facilities.

The City has ten (10) neighborhood and mini parks, four (4) community parks, two (2) undeveloped parks and five (5) school parks totaling 101.7 acres or 3.87 acres for every 1,000 residents. The City's Master Plan standard for parks is 5 acres per 1,000 residents. Therefore, the City has an existing deficit of 29.9 acres of park area. Additionally, to accommodate the anticipated population increase of 2,419 new residents by 2035, an additional 9.4 acres of park area will be required of new development to maintain the City's existing level of service. The acquisition of additional parkland will need to be funded with other sources of funds.

TRAILS AND OPEN SPACE AREAS

Open space areas are for passive uses and provide space for trails, picnic sites and jogging circuits. They also provide use of waterways or serve as transportation corridors for trails. The City owns and maintains 9.6 miles of trails and 319.3 acres of open space area within the City. It is the City's intention to continue the development of these areas when opportunities arise.



NEXUS STUDY LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS

Figure 2 below presents the City's Master Plan and existing level of service for parks, open space and trails. The LOS standards used in this Nexus Study for determining the park impact fee are shown in the last column of the table.

FIGURE 2 – EXISTING PARK FACILITIES AND COMPARISON OF LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS

		Level of Service ("LOS") Standard per 1,000 residents		
Type of Park / Area	Existing Facilities	1992 Master Plan	Existing	Nexus Study
	Acres	(Acres per 1,000 Residents)		
Neigborhood / Mini	22.1	3	0.84	0.84
Community	40.3	2	1.53	1.53
School Park Area 1	36.9	NA	1.40	1.40
Total Developed Park Area	99.30	5.00	3.77	3.77
Undeveloped Park Area	2.43	NA	0.09	Excluded
Open Space	319.3	NA	12.13	12.13
	Miles	(Miles per 1,000 Residents)		dents)
Trails	9.6	NA	0.37	0.37

Sources: City of Belmont Parks and Open Space Master Plan; Belmont "Parks at a Glance"

Notes:



¹ Represents only the area of school sites used for park and recreational activities.

This section presents the per capita cost calculation for park, open space and trail development and other associated costs based on the City's existing level of service standard for each.

DEVELOPMENT COSTS PER CAPITA

The figure below calculates the per capita cost of developing new parks in the City. As presented, the City's existing LOS standards are multiplied by their respective average development cost per acre to arrive at a per capita cost. The average park development cost per acre shown is based on recent cost estimates for the development of Davey Glen Park. The average development cost for trails assumes \$2.50 per linear foot for a 10 foot wide paved trail.

FIGURE 3 - PARK DEVELOPMENT COST PER CAPITA

Land Type	Acres per 1,000 Residents ¹	Acres per Capita ¹	Average Development Cost per Acre ²	Cost per Capita
Calo	a a	b = a / 1,000	С	d = p * c
Developed Parks	3.77	0.00377	\$448,000	\$1,688.96
Open Space	12.13	0.01213	\$5,000	\$60.67
Total Parks and Open Space	15.90	0.01590		\$1,749.63

Source: City of Belmont Parks and Recreation Department

Notes

¹ Based on the City's existing level of service for developed parks and open space area. See Figure 2.

² Based on estimated development cost per acre for 1.08 acre Davey Glen Park and rounded to the nearest thousand.

FIGURE 4 – TRAIL DEVELOPMENT COST PER CAPITA

Type of Park		Miles per 1,000 Population ¹	Miles per Capita ¹	Average Development Cost per Mile ²	Cost per Capita
	Calc	а	b = a / 1,000	С	d = b * c
Trails		0.37000	0.00037	\$132,000	\$48.84

Source: City of Belmont Parks and Recreation Department

Notes:

¹ Based on the City's existing level of service for trails. See Figure 2.

² Based on \$2.50 per linear foot for a 10-foot-wide paved pathway.

This section presents the calculation of the residential park impact fees based on the per capita cost for park, open space and trail development and fee program administrative costs for the different residential land uses in the City.

PARK IMPACT FEE COST COMPONENTS

The figure below summarizes the per capita cost components calculated in the previous section and includes an additional 5 percent for administration of the park impact fee program. Other City recreational facilities such as gymnasiums, community centers and aquatic facilities have been excluded from the Nexus Study and the resulting park impact fees. As shown, the sum of the three per capita cost components is \$1,888.39.

FIGURE 5 – PARK IMPACT FEE COST COMPONENTS

Cost Components	Per Capita Costs
Development (Parks, Trails and Open Space)	\$1,798.47
Park Impact Fee Program Administration ¹	\$89.92
Total Cost per Capita	\$1,888.39

Notes:

RESIDENTIAL LAND USE CATEGORIES

The Mitigation Fee Act requires that development impact fees be determined in a way that ensures a reasonable relationship between the fee and the type of development on which the fee is imposed. Therefore, since the demand for and need for park and recreational services created by the City's service population and since different residential land uses have varying household sizes, the park impact fee is expressed on a per unit basis based on their respective dwelling unit occupancy factor for three residential land use categories.

This Study also incorporates the addition of another residential unit to an existing property as a fourth category (labeled as "Second Unit").

The four residential land use categories are as follows:

"Single-family detached" means free-standing one-family dwelling units.



¹ Estimated at 5 percent of total costs for the administration of the park impact fee program including periodic nexus study updates, collection, accounting, annual reporting and other associated costs.

- "Single-family attached" means one-family dwelling units on separate parcels that share a common wall, such as townhomes.
- Multi-family residential" means buildings or structures designed for two or more families for living or sleeping purposes and having a kitchen and bath facilities for each family.
- "Second unit" means an additional living unit, or granny flat, either a detached or attached dwelling unit, which provides complete, independent living facilities for one or more persons with provisions for living, sleeping, eating, cooking, and sanitation on the same parcel as the primary residence.

DWELLING UNIT OCCUPANCY FACTOR

Based on 2010 U.S. Census information for City of Belmont, the figure below presents the dwelling unit occupancy factor calculation for three residential land use categories shown below. Insufficient data exists to calculate the average occupancy of additional residential units in the City; therefore, a conservative estimate of 1.0 person per unit is utilized.

FIGURE 6 – DWELLING UNIT OCCUPANCY FACTOR (CITY OF BELMONT)

Land Use Categories	Occupied Dwelling Units	Total Number of Occupants	Dwelling Unit Occupancy Factor c = a/b
Single-Family Detached Single-Family Attached Multi-Family Residential Second Units	6,092 545 3,654 NA	16,387 1,303 7,341 NA	2.69 2.39 2.01 1.00
Average (2010 Census)	10,291	25,031	2.43

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

RESIDENTIAL PARK IMPACT FEE

The figure below presents the calculation of the proposed residential park impact fee. As shown, each per unit fee for the four residential land use categories are determined by multiplying total cost per capita by their respective dwelling unit occupancy factor.

FIGURE 7 – RESIDENTIAL PARK IMPACT FEE

Residential Land Use Catergory	Total Cost Per Capita ¹	Dwelling Unit Occupancy Factor ²	Proposed Residential Park Impact Fee ³
Calc	а	b	c = a * b
Single-Family Detached	\$1,888.39	2.69	\$5,079
Single-Family Attached	\$1,888.39	2.39	\$4,513
Multi-Family Residential	\$1,888.39	2.01	\$3,795
Second Unit	\$1,888.39	1.00	\$1,888

Notes:

NEXUS FINDINGS FOR THE RESIDENTIAL PARK IMPACT FEE

This section frames the results of the Nexus Study in terms of the legislated requirements to demonstrate the legal justification of the residential park impact fee. The justification of the park impact fees on new development must provide information as set forth in Government Code § 66000 et seq. These requirements are discussed below.

IDENTIFY THE PURPOSE OF THE FEES

The purpose of the residential park impact fee is for development of parks, open space areas and trails and associated recreational facilities to meet the needs of the new residential population generated by new residential development.

IDENTIFY THE USE OF THE FEES

Fee revenue collected on new residential construction may be used to pay for any of the following:

- Construction / development of park and recreational facilities;
- Development of open space areas and trails;
- Park impact fee program administration costs including periodic nexus study updates, collection, documentation, accounting, annual reporting requirements and other associated costs:



¹ See Figure 5.

² See Figure 6.

³ Proposed residential park impact fees are rounded down to the nearest dollar.

 Other related park and recreational facility costs resulting from population growth caused by new residential development.

Fee revenue may not be used to fund the following:

- City operational costs
- Park maintenance or repair costs

The City does not anticipate that general fund or monies other than the fee proceeds will be available to fund the development of future parks, open space areas and trails.

DETERMINE HOW THERE IS A REASONABLE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE FEES' USE AND THE TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT PROJECT ON WHICH THE FEES ARE IMPOSED

Since the need for park and recreational services is in part population-driven, new residential development in the City will generate additional need for new parks and recreational services and the corresponding need for various facilities. The fee will be used to develop and expand the City's park and recreational facilities required to serve new development. The fee's use (development of parks, open space areas and trials) is therefore reasonably related to the type of project (new residential development) upon which it's imposed.

DETERMINE HOW THERE IS A REASONABLE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEED FOR THE PUBLIC FACILITIES AND THE TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS ON WHICH THE FEES ARE IMPOSED

Each new residential development project will generate additional need for park and recreational services and the associated need for parks, open space areas and trails. The need is measured in proportion to the occupancy per dwelling unit for four housing categories and the City's existing park standards.

DETERMINE HOW THERE IS A REASONABLE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE AMOUNT OF THE FEES AND THE COST OF THE PUBLIC FACILITIES OR PORTION OF THE PUBLIC FACILITIES ATTRIBUTABLE TO THE DEVELOPMENT ON WHICH THE FEES ARE IMPOSED

The amount of park and recreational facilities needed to serve a unit of development is based on the City's existing LOS standard for providing such facilities. The cost of park, open space and trail development and fee program administrative costs are defined on a cost per capita basis. These per capita costs are then applied to four housing types based on their respective dwelling unit occupancy factor.



In addition to the residents of the City, employees, who work in the City, also use and place demands upon the City's park and recreational facilities. Just as future growth in the residential population will impact park facilities, future growth in the City's employee population will also impact park facilities and additional park and recreational facilities are required for the future growth in employees within the City. Therefore, this section determines the park impact fee for nonresidential land uses.

EMPLOYEE EQUIVALENT DEMAND FACTOR

Employees use park and recreational facilities in a variety of ways. They participate in lunchtime activities, community center functions, before-work and after-work group functions, weekend company functions, company sponsored sports leagues, lunchtime trail use, etc. However, one employee is generally not considered to have the same demand for or impact upon park facilities as one resident. In general, residents of the City can use the City's park and recreation facilities year-round. Conversely, park and recreation facility use by employees is generally limited to shorter periods of time before and after work and during lunch or break times. This period of time available for park usage within the City is estimated to be two hours per day, five days per week. In order to establish an employee park usage factor of equivalence with residents, each resident is assumed to be able to use parks 16 hours per day, 365 days per year. Thus, for purposes of this Nexus Study, one employee is considered to have the equivalent park facilities demand of 0.09 residents.

FIGURE 8 - EMPLOYEE EQUIVALENT DEMAND FACTOR

Total Park Hours Available per Year ¹	5,840
Hours Available to Employees for Park Use ²	520
Employee Equivalent Demand Factor	0.09

Notes:



¹ 365 days per year, 16 hours per day.

² 52 weeks per year, 5 days per week, 2 hours per day out of a 10 hour day in the District.

NONRESIDENT EMPLOYEE FACTOR

In order to measure the impact from employees that do not live in the City, a nonresidential employee factor is determined using figures from the 2000 U.S. Census. As shown below, of the 13,919 employees working in the City in 2000, 12,512 were not residents of the City.¹ Therefore, for purposes of this Nexus Study, it is assumed that 90% of employees generated by new nonresidential development with the City will reside outside the City. 2000 Census figures are found to be reasonably representative of the same ratio today.

FIGURE 9 – NONRESIDENT EMPLOYEE FACTOR

Total Workers 16 Years and Over	13,919
Workers 16 Years and Over Not Living in Place	12,512
Nonresident Employee Factor	0.90

Source: 2000 U.S. Census for Belmont, California

COST PER EMPLOYEE

The figure below presents the calculation of the cost per employee based on the per capita cost multiplied by the residential equivalent factor and nonresident employee factor for nonresidential land uses. As shown the cost per employee is \$1,290.19 or the equivalent of 8 percent of the per capita cost for a City resident.

FIGURE 10 – COST PER EMPLOYEE

Land Use Category	Per Capita Costs ¹	Employee Equivalent Demand Factor ²	Nonresident Employee Factor ³	Cost per Employee
Calc	а	b	С	d = a * b * c
	\$1,888.39			

Notes:



¹ See Figure 5.

² See Figure 8.

³ See Figure 9.

¹ Similar data is not available in the 2010 U.S. Census.

Nonresidential Land Use Categories

As mentioned earlier, the Mitigation Fee Act requires that development impact fees be determined in a way that ensures a reasonable relationship between the fee and the type of development on which the fee is imposed. Since different commercial / industrial land uses have varying employment densities, the nonresidential park impact fee is expressed on a per square footage basis based on their respective employment density for three nonresidential land use categories.

The three nonresidential land use categories are as follows:

- "Retail / Other Commercial" means all retail, commercial, educational, hotel/motel and other commercial construction that is not office construction or industrial construction.
- "Office" means all general, professional and medical office construction.
- "Industrial" means all manufacturing construction.

Nonresidential Park Impact Fee Determination

In order to determine the nonresidential park impact fee, the cost per employee is applied to the three nonresidential land uses by their employment density to arrive at nonresidential park impact fees per square foot. The employment density figures based on the Southern California Association of Government ("SCAG") "Employment Density Study" dated October 31, 2001 prepared by The Natelson Company, Inc. Employment density studies are conducted infrequently. Other land appraisals and analyses within San Mateo County cite similar employment density figures, therefore the SCAG study is found to be representative of employment density with the City.²

Figure 11 on the following page presents the calculation of the proposed nonresidential park impact fee. As shown, each per square foot fee for the three nonresidential land use categories are determined by dividing total cost per employee by their respective building square footage per employee.

² Housing Mitigation Nexus and Fee Study, 2014 for City of Sunnyvale and Big Wave Development Local Employee Projection for San Mateo County, 2014 by Enright and Company, Inc.





FIGURE 11 - NONRESIDENTIAL PARK IMPACT FEE

Nonresidental Land Use	Cost per Employee ¹	Building Sq. Ft. Per Employee ²	Nonresidential Park Impact Fee (per sq. ft.) ³	
Calc	a	b	c = a / b	
Retail / Other Commercial	\$151.15	420	\$0.36	
Office	\$151.15	290	\$0.52	
Industrial	\$151.15	433	\$0.35	

Notes:

NEXUS FINDINGS FOR NONRESIDENTIAL PARK IMPACT FEES

This section frames the results of Nexus Study in terms of the legislated requirements to demonstrate the legal justification of the nonresidential park impact fee. The justification of the park impact fees on new development must provide information as set forth in Government Code § 66000 et seq. These requirements are discussed below.

IDENTIFY THE PURPOSE OF THE FEES

The purpose of the park impact fee is for development of parks, open space areas and trials and associated recreational facilities to meet the needs of the new nonresident employee population generated by new nonresidential construction.

IDENTIFY THE USE OF THE FEES

Revenue from fees collected on new nonresidential construction may be used to pay for any of the following:

- Construction / development of park and recreational facilities;
- Development of open space areas and trails;
- Park impact fee program administration costs including periodic nexus study updates, collection, documentation, accounting, annual reporting requirements and other associated costs; and
- Other related park and recreational facility costs resulting from population growth caused by new residential development.



¹ Total per employee cost for nonresidential land uses. See Figure 12.

² Employment density figures based on the Southern California Association of Government "Employment Density Study" dated October 31, 2001 prepared by The Natelson Company, Inc. The factors used represent the average values for the five county region.

³ Fees are rounded to the nearest cent.

Fee revenue may not be used to fund the following:

- City operational costs; and
- Park maintenance or repair costs.

The City does not anticipate that general fund or monies other than the fee proceeds will be available to fund the development of future parks, open space areas and trails.

DETERMINE HOW THERE IS A REASONABLE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE FEES' USE AND THE TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT PROJECT ON WHICH THE FEES ARE IMPOSED

New businesses will create new employees in the City who will use and create demand for new developed parks and recreational services and the corresponding need for various facilities. The nonresidential park impact fee will be used to develop and expand the City's parks facilities, open space area and trails required to serve new development. The fee's use (development of parks, open space areas and trials) is therefore reasonably related to the type of project (new nonresidential development) upon which it's imposed.

DETERMINE HOW THERE IS A REASONABLE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEED FOR THE PUBLIC FACILITIES AND THE TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS ON WHICH THE FEES ARE IMPOSED

Each new nonresidential development project will generate additional demand for park services and the associated need for developed parks, open space and trails. The demand is measured in proportion to employee equivalent demand factor and the employment density for retail/other commercial, office and industrial land uses categories.

DETERMINE HOW THERE IS A REASONABLE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE AMOUNT OF THE FEES AND THE COST OF THE PUBLIC FACILITIES OR PORTION OF THE PUBLIC FACILITIES ATTRIBUTABLE TO THE DEVELOPMENT ON WHICH THE FEES ARE IMPOSED

The amount of park and recreational facilities needed to serve a unit of nonresidential development is determined by multiplying the determined cost per employee by the employment density for retail/other commercial, office and industrial land uses.



This section contains general recommendations for the adoption and administration of the park impact fee program based on the findings of this Nexus Study and for the interpretation and application of the park impact fees recommended herein. The specific statutory requirements for the adoption and implementation may be found in the Mitigation Fee Act (California Govt. Code § 66000 et seq.)

ADOPTION REQUIREMENTS

The following are the general requirements for approval and adoption of the Park Impact Fee Nexus Study and proposed park impact fees.

- 1. The local agency shall conduct at least "one open and public meeting" as part of a regularly scheduled meeting on the proposed fees.
- 2. At least 14 days before the meeting, the local agency shall mail out a notice of the meeting to any interested party who filed a written request for notice of the adoption of new or increased fees.
- 3. At least 10 days before the meeting, the local agency is to make available to the public the Nexus Study for review.
- 4. At least 10 days before the public hearing, a notice of the time and place of the meeting, shall be published twice in a newspaper of general circulation.
- 5. The park impact fees take effect 60 days after adoption of the resolution or ordinance.

ACCOUNTING REQUIREMENTS

The park impact fees should be expended solely for the purpose for which they were collected. Any interest earned by such account should be deposited in that account and expended solely for the purpose for which originally collected.

ANNUAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The following information must be made available to the public within 180 days after the last day of each fiscal year:

- a brief description of the type of fee in the account;
- the amount of the fee;
- the beginning and ending balance of the account;
- the fees collected that year and the interest earned;



- an identification of each public improvement for which the fees were expended and the amount of the expenditures for each improvement;
- an identification of an approximate date by which construction of the improvement will commence if the local agency determines that sufficient funds have been collected to complete financing of an incomplete public improvement;
- a description of each inter-fund transfer or loan made from the account or fund, including the public improvement on which the transferred or loaned fees will be expended, the date on which any loan will be repaid, and the rate of interest to be returned to the account; and
- the amount of money refunded under section Govt. Code § 66001.

FIVE-YEAR REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

For the fifth fiscal year following the first receipt of any park impact fee proceeds, and every five years thereafter, the City shall make all of the following findings with respect to that portion of the account or fund remaining unexpended, whether committed or uncommitted:

- identify the purpose to which the fee is to be put;
- demonstrate a reasonable relationship between the fee and the purpose for which it is charged;
- identify all sources and amounts of funding anticipated to complete financing in incomplete improvements;
- designate the approximate dates on which the funding is expected to be deposited into the appropriate account or fund.



APPENDICES

Appendix A – Current and Projected City Population through 2035

Appendix B – Park and Open Space Inventory

Appendix C – Park Impact Fee Schedules by Cost Component



APPENDIX A - CURRENT AND PROJECTED POPULATION THROUGH 2035 (CITY OF BELMONT)

FIGURE 12 - POPULATION PROJECTION THROUGH 2035

Population Projection	2010	2014	2015	2020	2025	2030	2035
City of Belmont	25,835	26,316	26,500	27,200	27,700	28,200	28,735

Source: 2010 U.S. Census, Association of Bay Area Governments 2009 Population Projections and California Department of Finance

FIGURE 13 – PARK AND OPEN SPACE INVENTORY

Neighborhood / Mini Parks Alexander Park Cipriani Park Cipriani Park College View Park Hallmark Park Hastings Tot Lot McDougal Park O'Donnell Park Park D'Donnell Park Semeria Park D'20 Wakefield Park Total Neighborhood Parks Barrett Community Center Belameda Park Belmont Sports Complex Total Community Parks Total Community Parks School Park Acres Fox School Ralston Middle School Carlmont High School Central School Nesbit School Total School Park Acres Total School Park Acres Total Comyon Park San Juan Canyon Open Space Waterdog Lake Open Space Waterdog Lake Open Space Walston Ranch Park Davey Glen Park Log Park L	Name of Park / Area	Acres
Alexander Park Cipriani Park College View Park Hallmark Park Hastings Tot Lot McDougal Park O'Donnell Park O'Do	Neighborhood / Mini Parks	
College View Park Hallmark Park Hastings Tot Lot O.25 McDougal Park O'Donnell Park Patricia Wharton Park Semeria Park Wakefield Park Dotal Neighborhood Parks Barrett Community Center Belameda Park Belmont Sports Complex Total Community Parks Barlett Community Parks Barrett Park Dotal Community Parks Belmont Sports Complex Total Community Parks Total Community Parks School Park Acres Fox School Ralston Middle School Carlmont High School Carlmont High School Carlmont High School Total School Park Acres Total School Park Acres Open Space Hidden Canyon Park San Juan Canyon Open Space Waterdog Lake Open Space Waterdog Lake Open Space Total Open Space Total Open Space	•	1.35
College View Park Hallmark Park Hastings Tot Lot O.25 McDougal Park O'Donnell Park Patricia Wharton Park Semeria Park Wakefield Park Dotal Neighborhood Parks Barrett Community Center Belameda Park Belmont Sports Complex Total Community Parks Barlett Community Parks Barrett Park Belmont Sports Complex Total Community Parks Total Community Parks School Park Acres Fox School Ralston Middle School Carlmont High School Carlmont High School Carlmont High School Total School Park Acres Total School Park Acres Open Space Hidden Canyon Park San Juan Canyon Open Space Waterdog Lake Open Space Waterdog Lake Open Space Total Open Space Total Open Space	Cipriani Park	9.95
Hastings Tot Lot McDougal Park O'Donnell Park O'Don	· · · · · · ·	0.11
McDougal Park 0.90 Patricia Wharton Park 0.10 Semeria Park 0.20 Wakefield Park 1.05 Total Neighborhood Parks 22.13 Community Parks Barrett Community Center 5.00 Belameda Park 2.89 Belmont Sports Complex 12.56 Twin Pines Park 19.82 Total Community Parks 40.27 School Park Acres 1 Fox School 6.1 Ralston Middle School 7.4 Carlmont High School 3.4 Nesbit School 6.5 Total School Park Acres 36.9 Open Space Hidden Canyon Park 23.73 San Juan Canyon Open Space 35.00 Waterdog Lake Open Space 319.31 Undeveloped Parks Davey Glen Park 1.09 Ralston Ranch Park 1.34	Hallmark Park	5.21
O'Donnell Park 0.90 Patricia Wharton Park 0.10 Semeria Park 0.20 Wakefield Park 1.05 Total Neighborhood Parks 22.13 Community Parks Barrett Commumity Center 5.00 Belameda Park 2.89 Belmont Sports Complex 12.56 Twin Pines Park 19.82 Total Community Parks 40.27 School Park Acres 1 Fox School 6.1 Ralston Middle School 7.4 Carlmont High School 7.4 Carlmont High School 3.4 Nesbit School 3.4 Nesbit School 6.5 Total School Park Acres 36.9 Open Space Hidden Canyon Park 23.73 San Juan Canyon Open Space 35.00 Waterdog Lake Open Space 260.58 Total Open Space 319.31 Undeveloped Parks Davey Glen Park 1.09 Ralston Ranch Park 1.34	Hastings Tot Lot	0.25
O'Donnell Park 0.90 Patricia Wharton Park 0.10 Semeria Park 0.20 Wakefield Park 1.05 Total Neighborhood Parks 22.13 Community Parks Barrett Community Center 5.00 Belameda Park 2.89 Belmont Sports Complex 12.56 Twin Pines Park 19.82 Total Community Parks 40.27 School Park Acres 1 Fox School 6.1 Ralston Middle School 7.4 Carlmont High School 7.4 Carlmont High School 3.4 Nesbit School 3.4 Nesbit School 6.5 Total School Park Acres 36.9 Open Space Hidden Canyon Park 23.73 San Juan Canyon Open Space 35.00 Waterdog Lake Open Space 260.58 Total Open Space 319.31 Undeveloped Parks Davey Glen Park 1.09 Ralston Ranch Park 1.34	McDougal Park	3.01
Semeria Park Wakefield Park 1.05 Total Neighborhood Parks Community Parks Barrett Community Center Belameda Park Belmont Sports Complex Total Community Parks 12.56 Twin Pines Park 19.82 Total Community Parks School Park Acres Fox School Ralston Middle School Carlmont High School Carlmont High School Nesbit School Total School Park Acres 36.9 Open Space Hidden Canyon Park San Juan Canyon Open Space Waterdog Lake Open Space Waterdog Lake Open Space Total Open Space Total Open Space Undeveloped Parks Davey Glen Park 1.09 Ralston Ranch Park 1.34	· ·	0.90
Wakefield Park Total Neighborhood Parks 22.13 Community Parks Barrett Community Center Belameda Park 2.89 Belmont Sports Complex Twin Pines Park Total Community Parks 40.27 School Park Acres Fox School Ralston Middle School Carlmont High School Carlmont High School Central School Nesbit School Total School Park Acres 36.9 Open Space Hidden Canyon Park San Juan Canyon Open Space Waterdog Lake Open Space Waterdog Lake Open Space Total Open Space Total Open Space Total Open Space 1.09 Ralston Ranch Park 1.09 Ralston Ranch Park 1.34	Patricia Wharton Park	0.10
Total Neighborhood Parks Community Parks Barrett Community Center Belameda Park Belmont Sports Complex Total Community Parks Total Community Parks School Park Acres Fox School Ralston Middle School Carlmont High School Carlmont High School Nesbit School Total School Park Acres Total School Park Acres School Park Acres Total School Total School Total School Total School Park Acres Total School Park Ban Juan Canyon Open Space Waterdog Lake Open Space Waterdog Lake Open Space Total Open Space	Semeria Park	0.20
Community Parks Barrett Community Center 5.00 Belameda Park 2.89 Belmont Sports Complex 12.56 Twin Pines Park 19.82 Total Community Parks 40.27 School Park Acres 1 Fox School 6.1 Ralston Middle School 7.4 Carlmont High School 3.4 Nesbit School 6.5 Total School Park Acres 36.9 Open Space Hidden Canyon Park 23.73 San Juan Canyon Open Space 35.00 Waterdog Lake Open Space 260.58 Total Open Space 319.31 Undeveloped Parks Davey Glen Park 1.09 Ralston Ranch Park 1.34	Wakefield Park	1.05
Barrett Commumity Center Belameda Park 2.89 Belmont Sports Complex Twin Pines Park 19.82 Total Community Parks 40.27 School Park Acres Fox School Ralston Middle School Carlmont High School Nesbit School Nesbit School 7.4 Carlmont High School Anselit School Nesbit School Total School Park Acres 36.9 Open Space Hidden Canyon Park San Juan Canyon Open Space Waterdog Lake Open Space Waterdog Lake Open Space Total Open Space Undeveloped Parks Davey Glen Park 1.09 Ralston Ranch Park 1.34	Total Neighborhood Parks	
Barrett Commumity Center Belameda Park 2.89 Belmont Sports Complex Twin Pines Park 19.82 Total Community Parks 40.27 School Park Acres Fox School Ralston Middle School Carlmont High School Nesbit School Nesbit School Total School Park Acres Total School Park Acres Open Space Hidden Canyon Park San Juan Canyon Open Space Waterdog Lake Open Space Waterdog Lake Open Space Total Open Space Undeveloped Parks Davey Glen Park 1.09 Ralston Ranch Park 1.34	Community Parks	
Belameda Park 2.89 Belmont Sports Complex 12.56 Twin Pines Park 19.82 Total Community Parks 40.27 School Park Acres 1 Fox School 6.1 Ralston Middle School 7.4 Carlmont High School 3.4 Nesbit School 6.5 Total School Park Acres 36.9 Open Space Hidden Canyon Park 23.73 San Juan Canyon Open Space 35.00 Waterdog Lake Open Space 260.58 Total Open Space 319.31 Undeveloped Parks Davey Glen Park 1.09 Ralston Ranch Park 1.34		5.00
Twin Pines Park 19.82 Total Community Parks 40.27 School Park Acres Fox School 6.1 Ralston Middle School 7.4 Carlmont High School 3.4 Nesbit School 6.5 Total School Park Acres 36.9 Open Space Hidden Canyon Park 23.73 San Juan Canyon Open Space Waterdog Lake Open Space 260.58 Total Open Space Undeveloped Parks Davey Glen Park 1.09 Ralston Ranch Park 40.27		2.89
Twin Pines Park 19.82 Total Community Parks 40.27 School Park Acres Fox School 6.1 Ralston Middle School 7.4 Carlmont High School 3.4 Nesbit School 6.5 Total School Park Acres 36.9 Open Space Hidden Canyon Park 23.73 San Juan Canyon Open Space Waterdog Lake Open Space 260.58 Total Open Space Undeveloped Parks Davey Glen Park 1.09 Ralston Ranch Park 40.27	Belmont Sports Complex	12.56
Total Community Parks 40.27 School Park Acres 1		19.82
Fox School 6.1 Ralston Middle School 7.4 Carlmont High School 13.5 Central School 3.4 Nesbit School 6.5 Total School Park Acres 36.9 Open Space Hidden Canyon Park 23.73 San Juan Canyon Open Space 35.00 Waterdog Lake Open Space 260.58 Total Open Space 319.31 Undeveloped Parks 1.09 Ralston Ranch Park 1.34	Total Community Parks	
Ralston Middle School 7.4 Carlmont High School 13.5 Central School 3.4 Nesbit School 6.5 Total School Park Acres 36.9 Open Space Hidden Canyon Park 23.73 San Juan Canyon Open Space 35.00 Waterdog Lake Open Space 260.58 Total Open Space 319.31 Undeveloped Parks Davey Glen Park 1.09 Ralston Ranch Park 1.34	School Park Acres ¹	
Carlmont High School 13.5 Central School 3.4 Nesbit School 6.5 Total School Park Acres 36.9 Open Space Hidden Canyon Park 23.73 San Juan Canyon Open Space 35.00 Waterdog Lake Open Space 260.58 Total Open Space 319.31 Undeveloped Parks Davey Glen Park 1.09 Ralston Ranch Park 1.34	Fox School	6.1
Central School 3.4 Nesbit School 6.5 Total School Park Acres 36.9 Open Space Hidden Canyon Park 23.73 San Juan Canyon Open Space 35.00 Waterdog Lake Open Space 260.58 Total Open Space 319.31 Undeveloped Parks Davey Glen Park 1.09 Ralston Ranch Park 1.34	Ralston Middle School	7.4
Nesbit School 6.5 Total School Park Acres 36.9 Open Space Hidden Canyon Park 23.73 San Juan Canyon Open Space 35.00 Waterdog Lake Open Space 260.58 Total Open Space 319.31 Undeveloped Parks Davey Glen Park 1.09 Ralston Ranch Park 1.34	Carlmont High School	13.5
Total School Park Acres 36.9 Open Space Hidden Canyon Park 23.73 San Juan Canyon Open Space 35.00 Waterdog Lake Open Space 260.58 Total Open Space 319.31 Undeveloped Parks Davey Glen Park 1.09 Ralston Ranch Park 1.34	Central School	3.4
Open Space Hidden Canyon Park San Juan Canyon Open Space Waterdog Lake Open Space Total Open Space Undeveloped Parks Davey Glen Park Ralston Ranch Park 1.09 Ralston Ranch Park	Nesbit School	6.5
Hidden Canyon Park 23.73 San Juan Canyon Open Space 35.00 Waterdog Lake Open Space 260.58 Total Open Space 319.31 Undeveloped Parks Davey Glen Park 1.09 Ralston Ranch Park 1.34	Total School Park Acres	36.9
San Juan Canyon Open Space 35.00 Waterdog Lake Open Space 260.58 Total Open Space 319.31 Undeveloped Parks Davey Glen Park 1.09 Ralston Ranch Park 1.34	Open Space	
Waterdog Lake Open Space 260.58 Total Open Space 319.31 Undeveloped Parks Davey Glen Park 1.09 Ralston Ranch Park 1.34	Hidden Canyon Park	23.73
Total Open Space 319.31 Undeveloped Parks Davey Glen Park 1.09 Ralston Ranch Park 1.34	San Juan Canyon Open Space	35.00
Undeveloped Parks Davey Glen Park 1.09 Ralston Ranch Park 1.34		
Davey Glen Park 1.09 Ralston Ranch Park 1.34		
Ralston Ranch Park 1.34	•	1 00
	,	
	Total Undeveloped Parks	2.43

Notes:



¹ Represents only the area of school sites used for park and recreational activities.

FIGURE 14 – PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL PARK IMPACT FEE SCHEDULE BY COST COMPONENT

	Dwelling	Development Costs				
Residential Land Use	Unit Occupancy				Fee Program	
Catergory	Factor	Parks	Open Space	Trails	Administration	Total
Per Capita Cost		\$1,688.96	\$60.67	\$48.84	\$89.92	\$1,888.39
Cost / Fee per Unit						
Single-Family Detached	2.69	\$4,543	\$163	\$131	\$242	\$5,079
Single-Family Attached	2.39	\$4,037	\$145	\$117	\$215	\$4,513
Multi-Family Residential	2.01	\$3,395	\$122	\$98	\$181	\$3,795
Second Unit	1.00	\$1,689	\$61	\$49	\$90	\$1,888

FIGURE 15 - NONRESIDENTIAL PARK IMPACT FEE SCHEDULE BY COST COMPONENT

Nonresidential Land Use Category	Building Sq. Ft. Per Employee	Development (Parks,Trails and Open Space)	Fee Program Administration	Total
Per Employee Cost		\$143.95	\$7.20	\$151.15
Cost / Fee per Sq. Ft.				
Retail / Other Commercial	420	\$0.34	\$0.02	\$0.36
Office	290	\$0.50	\$0.02	\$0.52
Industrial	433	\$0.33	\$0.02	\$0.35

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

